

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-7 and claims 14-18 were previously canceled, and claims 10-13 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein by this response. Claim 19 is added by this response. Thus, claims 8-9 and 19 are pending in the present application, of which claim 8 is independent.

Noted - Priority Document Received By USPTO

The indication (see the Office Action Summary, boxes 12(a)(1) are checked) that the certified copy of the priority document has been received by the USPTO is noted with appreciation.

Noted – Information Disclosure Statements Considered

The indication (see Examiner-initialed attachments to the Office Actions dated October 29, 2007 and June 6, 2008) that the Information Disclosure Statements as filed on February 11, 2004 and March 18, 2008 and references listed therein have been considered is noted with appreciation.

Noted - Drawings Approved

The indication (see Office Action Summary of the Office Action dated June 6, 2008, boxes 10(a) are checked) that the Drawings (submitted on March 31, 2008) have been approved is noted with appreciation.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By the foregoing amendments, the claims have been canceled. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US. Pub. No. 2003/0101450 A1 to Davidsson et al. (hereinafter "Davidsson et al. reference") reference in view of US. Pat. No. 5,929,927 to Rumreich et al. (hereinafter "Rumreich et al. reference"), claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidsson et al. reference in view of US. Pat. No. 6,434,556 to Levin et al. (hereinafter "Levin et al. reference"), and claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidsson et al. reference in view of US. Pub. No. 2002/0103917 to Kay et al. (hereinafter "Kay et al. reference").

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 8

As an example, independent claim 8 recites (among other things) the following features:

storing a log collection interval;
collecting text data relating to a moving image content being streamed by the streaming server at one or more moments within the log collection interval, the text data being written from a user terminal;
counting the amount of collected text data and storing the same in the streaming server;
superimposing the collected text data on the moving image content being streamed by the streaming server; and
delivering the moving image content on which the collected text data is superimposed to the user terminal by the streaming server,
wherein the streaming server determines display time for the collected text data based on the count, the maximum amount of text data which can be displayed on the screen at a time and the log collection interval

(Underlining is added for emphasis.) As will be explained below, at least these features of claim 8 provide distinctions over each of Davidsson et al. reference and Rumreich et al. reference, and thus over their combination.

Regarding Davidsson et al. reference, since the chat communications are received via the bi-directional communications link and then displayed on the display, the log collection interval is not needed. Accordingly, Davidsson et al. reference

does not show that the display time based on a log collection interval. Hence, at least the above noted features of claim 8, namely "determines display time for the collected text data based on the count, the maximum amount of text data which can be displayed on the screen at a time and the log collection interval," provides distinctions over the Davidsson et al. reference. (Underlining is added for emphasis.)

Regarding Rumreich et al. reference, since the text is scrolled into the display at a rate whose duration is related to the amount of previously undisplayed text stored in the buffer memory, the log collection interval is not needed. Further, the Rumreich et al. reference does not even mention a log collection interval. As such, the Rumreich et al. reference does not describe that a display time is determined by based on the log collection interval. Hence, at least the above noted features of claim 8, namely "determines display time for the collected text data based on the count, the maximum amount of text data which can be displayed on the screen at a time and the log collection interval," provides distinctions over the Rumreich et al. reference. (Underlining is added for emphasis.)

Among other things, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must establish that the asserted combination of references teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. In view of the distinctions of claim 8 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in the asserted combination of references. Hence, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness vis-à-vis claim 8. Claim 9 ultimately depends from claim 8, and so at least similarly distinguishes over the asserted combination of references.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 10

By the foregoing amendments, the claim has been canceled. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 12

By the foregoing amendments, the claim has been canceled. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claims 8-9, 10-11 and 12-13 is improper. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Again, new claim 19 has been added. New claim 19 ultimately depends from claim 8, and so at least similarly distinguishes over the asserted combination of references.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 50-4610.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 8, 2009

By /Scott A. Elchert/

Scott A. Elchert
Registration No.: 55,149
Phone: (202) 285-4177

Fujitsu Patent Center
FUJITSU MGMT SERVICES OF AMERICA, INC.
PTO Customer No.: 79326